



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,510	03/17/2004	Aravind Doss	ITL0902US (P15219)	3982
21906 7590 11/24/2008 TROP PRUNER & HU, PC 1616 S. VOSS ROAD, SUITE 750 HOUSTON, TX 77057-2631				
EXAMINER CAO, DIEM K				
ART UNIT 2194		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 11/24/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/802,510

**Applicant(s)**

DOSS ET AL.

**Examiner**

DIEM K. CAO

**Art Unit**

2194

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-9 and 18-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-9 and 18-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 18-25 are pending. Applicant has amended claim 4 and canceled claims 10-17.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. **Claims 1-4 and 6, 8-9, 18-22, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brumme et al. (U.S. 6,134,559).**

As to claim 1, Brumme teaches a method comprising:

- providing a first request to access a function associated with a first object mode (an example query by a client to query an object stored in a relational database; col. 33, lines 14-15 and the attributes of an object can only be accessed by calling a method within the object; col. 19, lines 11-13 and The OLE client 272 may utilize the CORBA object 274; col. 11, lines 8-9);
- converting the first request into a second request associated with a second object model different from the first object model (an adapter, which supports the target data source, parses the query out ... mapped to the specific data source being supported; col. 32, lines 6-9 and col. 33, lines 17-20); and

Art Unit: 2194

- creating an object associated with the second object model in response to the second request (for objects that specify a strict encapsulation barrier, no copy is generated, and the object is activated to access or query the object; col. 19, lines 21-55 and col. 34, lines 19-24).

As to claim 2, Brumme teaches executing a script to create the second request (The object oriented environment accepts declarative scripts, such as through fourth generation languages (4GL) scripts, as a means to provide functionality to the system; col. 29, lines 4-7).

As to claim 3, Brumme teaches retrieving a script in response to the first request (When a method in a foreign object is called ... the functionality; col. 29, lines 12-17).

As to claim 4, Brumme teaches converting between protocols from different vendors (CORBA object, OLE object, conversion; col. 11, lines 1-22).

As to claim 6, Brumme teaches wherein the first request is associated with fabrication of an integrated circuit (col. 7, lines 20-26. It is noted that the specification does not disclose any definition regarding "fabrication of an integrated circuit").

As to claim 8, Brumme teaches providing a mechanism to discover services (col. 25, lines 55-60 and col. 26, lines 25-32).

As to claim 9, Brumme teaches distributing agents on different servers (adapters; col. 9, lines 25-31).

As to claim 18, it is the same as the method claim of claim 1 except this is a computer product claim and is rejected under the same ground of rejection.

As to claims 19-22 and 24-25, see rejections of claims 2-4, 6 and 8-9 above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**5. Claims 7 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brumme et al. (U.S. 6,134,559).**

As to claim 7, Brumme does not explicitly teach converting between asynchronous and synchronous communication. However, it is well known in the art that CORBA, COM or OLE objects support both synchronous communication and asynchronous communication. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the system of Brumme is capable of converting between asynchronous and synchronous communication in order to support any type of foreign object types. It is further note that the

specification did not disclose how the converting between asynchronous and synchronous communication is implemented or in which situation that the conversion is needed.

As to claim 23, see rejection of claim 7 above.

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed 8/27/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks, Applicant argued in substance that (1) Brumme fails to teach creating an object associated with a second object model in response to a second request, which is converted from a first request to access a function associated with a first object model.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the arguments:

As to the point (1), Brumme teaches a uniform object model integrates foreign objects such as OLE objects, CORBA objects, COM objects, etc., into uniform object model objects (col. 6, lines 16-48) via associated adapters for use at run time (col. 10, lines 55-67 and col. 11, lines 1-13). Examiner interpreted the OLE objects are associated with the OLE object model, the CORBA objects are associated with the CORBA object model, and the COM objects are associated with the COM object model. At run time, a CORBA object client may invoke functions of a COM object (col. 10, lines 55-67), or an OLE object client can utilize a CORBA object (col. 11, lines 1-13). During runtime, the client establishes a connection to an adapter to perform an operation in a target foreign object system, after obtaining a connection, client may

execute operations, through the adapter, to foreign object systems. In response to the client request, the adapter generates instance of foreign objects (which examiner consider as “creating an object”. This created object will be associated with the target foreign object which examiner considered as “second object model”). See col. 26, lines 25-44. Furthermore, Brumme teaches converting a request from a first object model to a second request associated with a second object model (col. 32, lines 4-14).

Therefore, Brumme teaches the claimed limitations.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DIEM K. CAO whose telephone number is (571)272-3760. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:30AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Meng-Ai An/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2195

DC  
November 18, 2008